UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE                        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/522,519      | 02/28/2005                         | Kyoko Yokoi          | TIP-05-1007         | 1423             |
|                 | 7590 03/20/200<br>DLA PIPER US LLP | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| ONE LIBERTY     | PLACE                              | CHRISS, JENNIFER A   |                     |                  |
| PHILADELPH      | ST, SUITE 4900<br>IA, PA 19103     |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                 |                                    |                      | 1794                |                  |
|                 |                                    |                      |                     |                  |
|                 |                                    |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                 |                                    |                      | 03/20/2008          | PAPER            |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No.  | Applicant(s) |  |
|------------------|--------------|--|
| 10/522,519       | YOKOI ET AL. |  |
| For a modern and |              |  |
| Examiner         | Art Unit     |  |

| JE   | NNIFER A. CHRISS   | 1794   |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears   | on the cover sheet with the  | correspondence addr  | ess                                     |
| THE REPLY FILED 12 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL   | CATION IN CONDITION FOR  | ALLOWANCE.   |   |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following rep application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR periods:   | same day as filing a Notice of<br>lies: (1) an amendment, affidav<br>(with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid aban<br>it, or other evidence, w<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request           |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advis no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).   | ory Action, or (2) the date set forth than SIX MONTHS from the mailin                                | g date of the final rejection  | n.                                      |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on whave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shor set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ion and the corresponding amount tened statutory period for reply orig                               | of the fee. The appropria<br>inally set in the final Office                | te extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complian filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extensic Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within AMENDMENTS   | n thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to  | avoid dismissal of the   |   |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consic  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or  | leration and/or search (see NO   | TE below);<br>ducing or simplifying th                                     |   |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corr<br>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 at 1.116 at 1.116 at 1.116 at 1.111 at 1.111.)  | and 41.33(a)).   |  | PTOL-324).                              |
| <ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  |  | timely filed amendmen  | t canceling the                         |
| 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 5-8. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  | ll be entered and an ex  | planation of                            |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |  |  |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but be<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and su<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  |  |  |   |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a N entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary an  | come <u>all</u> rejections under appe  | al and/or appellant fails  | to provide a                            |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  |  | ·  |   |
| <ul> <li>11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but do See Continuation Sheet.</li> <li>12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PT</li> </ul>   |  |  | ce because:                             |
| 13. Other:   | оловлов) тарег 140(5). <u>1123100</u>  |  |   |
| /Jennifer A Chriss/<br>Examiner, Art Unit 1794   | /Ula C Ruddock/<br>Primary Examiner, Art U   | Jnit 1794  |   |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: newly proposed claim 9 would require further search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. NOTE: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant does not provide a clear definition of pigment or dye in the Specification. Therefore, the Examiner has interpreted "pigment" as broadly as the term reasonably allows. The Examiner has provided the definition in Hawley's Chemical Dictionary to establish that there is generally no distinction between dyes (such as those used by the prior art) and pigments (as claimed by Applicant). Applicant argues that Hawley's definition, in fact, establishes that pigments and dyes are different. The definition does discuss solubility and method of application but notes that is one proposed distinction. However, if this distinction is absolute, they only describe the mode and method of application but does not imply any definitive impact on the resulting final structure which is claimed. Applicant has provided a definition for dye which indicates that dyes are used in solution while pigments are used in suspension. As mentioned above, the definition does not imply any definitive impact on the resulting final structure which is claimed. In regards to the method claim 7, the claim does not provide for an actual pigmenting step or a step where the coloring material is being used in suspension (rather than solution). Applicant's arguments in regards to the method claims are not commensurate in scope with the claim. Applicant indicates that the scouring step of Gandhi would remove the vast majority of pigment particles, however, the Applicant does not provide any evidence to support this conclusion.